

Printed: 04-29-97
By: Howe, Carol
Priority: Normal
Topic: Re: Re: Comments on summary
Sent: 04-28-97
From: rwoodard@goldeneye.water.ca.go
To: Howe, Carol; Carol Howe

Mail*Link»

Re: Re: Comments on summary

>Date: Fri, 25 Apr 1997 16:33:01 -0700 (PDT)
>From: Vic DeVlaming <vicdv@bptcpl.swrcb.ca.gov>
>Subject: Re: Re: Comments on summary
>To: Bruce Thompson <brucet@sfei.org>
>cc: HBailey@evs.wa.com, Gfredlee@aol.com, AWCONSULT@aol.com,
Aquasci@aol.com,
> chrisf@bptcpl.swrcb.ca.gov, bobf@delta.dfg.ca.gov,
Bherbold@aol.com,
> bfinlays@hq.dfg.ca.gov, dmfray@ucdavis.edu, dehinton@ucdavis.edu,
> jtm@crl.com, jay@sfei.org, lhsmith@usgs.gov, kkuivila@usgs.gov,
> karent@bptcpl.swrcb.ca.gov, mjsnyder@ucdavis.edu,
> lwintern@water.ca.gov, lrbrown@usgs.gov, Phyllisfox@aol.com,
> nsinghasemanon@cdpr.ca.gov, MJUNGINC@aol.com, spies@amarine.com,
> snluoma@usgs.gov, slanderson@lbl.gov, cdarling@water.ca.gov,
> wabennett@ucdavis.edu, valc@bptcpl.swrcb.ca.gov,
rwoodard@water.ca.gov
>
>Bruce-
I strongly disagree with your statement that we are out of hand and the
Fred overstated his point. Being in a regulator position I hear and see
>every day that we can't take action until the fish float belly up. Why
>do we attempt to prevent pollution (if indeed we do) if no actions will
>be taken until significant populations declines are validated? There are
>several cases of pollution where, in many scientists opinions, there is
>enough evidence (not 99 or '100% sure, but 85% or so) for corrective
>action. We can never be completely sure about anything. I do agree that
>there are other potential pollution problems where there is not enough
>information to act on, but, give me a break, we have enough evidence to
>take action to reduce the offsite movement of OP pesticides.
>Victor
>
>On Fri, 25 Apr 1997, Bruce Thompson wrote:
>
>> The "bodycount" analogy is out of hand. Fred overstated the concept. In
>> other forums, he has used that very argument, that we must look for
>> effects first (so called Evaluation Monitoring): a basic concept, with
>> which I agree, that we need to have some evidence of biological effects
in
>> order to know what the problems are. We all know that doing that is
>> usually quite subtle (sublethal biomarkers, bioaccumulation, growth rate
>> reductions etc.). Nobody can honestly believe "bodycounts" are necessary.
>> Most of the comments have said essentially, "lets prioritize and proceed
>> sensibly". There is alot of middle ground between what CALFED's draft
proposed and studying the system "to death". To me, the obvious next
step

>> is to work towards an well thought out wat to do that. Overstatement gets
>> us nowhere.
>> *****
>> At 07:32 PM 4/25/97 GMT, Howard Bailey wrote:
>> >I have to say that i agree 100% with Fred's and Victor's comments. We
>> need to
>> >take action on the basis of our best professional judgement with the
intent
>> >that systems be protected prior to their reaching a level of
perturbation
>> >from which they cannot regain their old structure.
>> >
>> >One can argue that there are no vacant niches; once a system has reached
a
>> >new equilibrium, it is very difficult to restore to its old
configuration.
>> >
>> >Awaiting a body count to mount up may give us a higher level of
confidence
>> >that we are actually doing the right thing but at some point there are
no
>> >bodies left to count and we still won't have the assurance that we have
>> >correctly identified the causative mechanism.
>> >
>> >If we look at the system, we know that flows and exports affect it,
there are
>> >lethal levels of pesticides seasonally present, and that certain metals
>> >(including Se) are also be of concern. There is more than enough to
address
>> >in just in this narrow range of perturbants (i.e., programs to control
>> >offsite movement of pesticides, changes in flows through the system to
mimic
>> >historical patterns, and altering the extent of exports). The problem
of
>> >course is that changes in any of these areas affect some user group and
the
>> >least intrusive course to follow is simply conducting additional studies
(no
>> >one gets offended and the scientific community continues to get funded).

>> >From a people perspective this is a nice approach, but it doesn't do
much for
>> >the ecosystem.
>> >
>> >regards,
>> >hb
>> >
>> >
>>
>